



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HN
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/679,333	10/04/2000	Stefan Hepper	DE919990073US1	6558
46369	7590	03/23/2005	EXAMINER	
HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C. 5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE ALBANY, NY 12203			LANIER, BENJAMIN E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/679,333	HEPPER ET AL.
	Examiner Benjamin E Lanier	Art Unit 2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 October 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 14 February 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., any processing protocol between the server and client which would minimize data transfers between the server and the client) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
3. Applicant's argument that the terminal in Peyret is not able to read the content of the messages from the server is not persuasive because Peyret discloses a communication interface between the terminal and the server (Fig. 4, 90, 92).
4. Applicant's argument that Chen does not describe a chipcard is not persuasive because Chen discloses that the application programs are unpacked and transferred to memory expansion cards (Col. 8, line 66 – Col. 9, line 3), which is a memory chip card. The fact that Chen uses a memory chip card and not a smart card is irrelevant since the claims require a chip card.
5. Applicant's allegation that the portable computer of Chen was analogized to the chip card is not persuasive because in the Office Action dated 13 January 2005, the portable computer was analogized to the terminal and the memory chip card is analogized to the chip card. Therefore, Chen's method for installing an application wherein a desktop manager on the user terminal unpacks the application program before installing the program on the memory chip card (Col. 8,

line 66 – Col. 9, line 22), meets the limitation of unpacking of the data packet by the client, and transmission of the individual commands from the packet in sequence to the chipcard.

6. Applicant's argument that the rationale for combining Chen and Peyret is deficient because there is not input or interface capability on a chipcard or smart card is not persuasive because as is well known in the art the memory chip card of Chen is used with the portable computer, which contains a user interface and display, and the smart card of Peyret is used with a terminal that also has a user interface (Col. 7, lines 43-49).

7. In response to applicant's argument that minimizing decisions required of a user is not relevant to the claimed functionality of Applicant's process, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 12-15, 17, 18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peyret, U.S. Patent No. 5,923,884, in view of Chen, U.S. Patent No. 6,360,364, and further in view of Zumkehr, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,529. Referring to claims 1, 4, 6, 12-15, 17, Peyret discloses a method for loading applications onto a smart card wherein the system includes a smart card, terminal (client), and a server (Fig. 4). The smart card has a first interface system that may connect the smart card to the terminal and second interface to connect the terminal to the server (Fig. 4 & Col. 7, lines 33-39). When the smart card is connected to the terminal, the processor of the smart card, verifies the authenticity of the terminal and of the server and visa versa. If the server and the smart card authenticate each other, then the loader within the smart card begins the loading process (Col. 7, lines 42-67). Once an application is selected, which meets the limitation of loading a sequence of commands to download the application component to the chipcard, to be loaded the smart card authenticates the application code through the use of digital signatures (Col. 9, lines 50-53). Digital signatures utilize private or secret keys, which meet the limitation of delivery of a secret key or session key by the server, generation of a digital signature with the secret key or session key by way of each command within the command sequence, transmission of the signed command sequence as a data packet to the client. If the digital signature is valid then the application is loaded onto the smart card (Col. 9, lines 54-57), which meets the limitation of checking of the digital signature and execution of the commands if the digital signature is correct. Peyret does not disclose that the application is unpacked at the user terminal before being installed on the smart card. Chen discloses a method for installing an application wherein a desktop manager on the user terminal unpacks the

application program before installing the program on the smart card (Col. 8, line 66 – Col. 9, line 22), which meets the limitation of unpacking of the data packet by the client and transmission of the individual commands in sequence to the smart card. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to unpack the application program of Peyret on the user terminal before transferring the application to the smart card in order to minimize the decisions required of a user when installing an application as taught in Chen (Col. 9, lines 24-26). Peyret does not disclose that each individual instruction of the application is digital signed. Zumkehr discloses a system for error detection wherein individual program instructions are digitally signed and later authenticated (Col. 2, lines 29-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the application instructions of Peyret to be digitally signed in order to provide low detection latency as taught in Zumkehr (Col. 2, lines 47-50).

Referring to claim 8, Peyret discloses that the cryptosystem used can be a public key cryptosystem (asymmetrical) (Col. 5, lines 31-33).

11. Claims 2, 7, 10, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peyret, U.S. Patent No. 5,923,884, in view of Chen, U.S. Patent No. 6,360,364, and further in view of Zumkehr, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,529 as applied to claims 1-3, 17 above, and further in view of Everett, U.S. Patent No. 6,575,372. Referring to claims 2, 7, 10, 19, Peyret discloses a method for loading applications onto a smart card wherein the system includes a smart card, terminal (client), and a server (Fig. 4). The smart card has a first interface system that may connect the smart card to the terminal and second interface to connect the terminal to the server (Fig. 4 & Col. 7, lines 33-39). When the smart card is connected to the terminal, the processor of

the smart card, verifies the authenticity of the terminal and of the server and visa versa. If the server and the smart card authenticate each other, then the loader within the smart card begins the loading process (Col. 7, lines 42-67). Once an application is selected, which meets the limitation of loading a sequence of commands to download the application component to the chipcard, to be loaded the smart card authenticates the application code through the use of digital signatures (Col. 9, lines 50-53). Digital signatures utilize private or secret keys, which meet the limitation of delivery of a secret key or session key by the server, generation of a digital signature with the secret key or session key by way of each command within the command sequence, transmission of the signed command sequence as a data packet to the client. If the digital signature is valid then the application is loaded onto the smart card (Col. 9, lines 54-57), which meets the limitation of checking of the digital signature and execution of the commands if the digital signature is correct. Chen discloses a method for installing an application wherein a desktop manager on the user terminal unpacks the application program before installing the program on the smart card (Col. 8, line 66 – Col. 9, line 22), which meets the limitation of unpacking of the data packet by the client and transmission of the individual commands in sequence to the smart card. Zumkehr discloses a system for error detection wherein individual program instructions are digitally signed and later authenticated (Col. 2, lines 29-47). Peyret does not disclose that the keys are generated based on card identification data. Everett discloses an IC card loading system wherein to generate cryptographic keys for each individual IC card, a certificate authority uses card identification information transmitted from the terminal in order to generate individual key sets for the IC cards (Col. 5, lines 42-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the cryptographic keys of

Art Unit: 2132

Peyret to be generated based on the IC card identification data in order to easily identify and authenticate the cards at a later point in time as taught in Everett (Col. 8, lines 25-34).

12. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peyret, U.S. Patent No. 5,923,884, in view of Chen, U.S. Patent No. 6,360,364, and further in view of Zumkehr, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,529 as applied to claims 1, 13 above, and further in view of Hanel, GB 2,314,948. Referring to claim 16, Peyret discloses a method for loading applications onto a smart card wherein the system includes a smart card, terminal (client), and a server (Fig. 4). The smart card has a first interface system that may connect the smart card to the terminal and second interface to connect the terminal to the server (Fig. 4 & Col. 7, lines 33-39). When the smart card is connected to the terminal, the processor of the smart card, verifies the authenticity of the terminal and of the server and visa versa. If the server and the smart card authenticate each other, then the loader within the smart card begins the loading process (Col. 7, lines 42-67). Once an application is selected, which meets the limitation of loading a sequence of commands to download the application component to the chipcard, to be loaded the smart card authenticates the application code through the use of digital signatures (Col. 9, lines 50-53). Digital signatures utilize private or secret keys, which meet the limitation of delivery of a secret key or session key by the server, generation of a digital signature with the secret key or session key by way of each command within the command sequence, transmission of the signed command sequence as a data packet to the client. If the digital signature is valid then the application is loaded onto the smart card (Col. 9, lines 54-57), which meets the limitation of checking of the digital signature and execution of the commands if the digital signature is correct. Chen discloses a method for installing an application wherein a desktop manager on the

user terminal unpacks the application program before installing the program on the smart card (Col. 8, line 66 – Col. 9, line 22), which meets the limitation of unpacking of the data packet by the client and transmission of the individual commands in sequence to the smart card. Zumkehr discloses a system for error detection wherein individual program instructions are digitally signed and later authenticated (Col. 2, lines 29-47). Peyret does not disclose using message authentication codes in the command codes. Hanel discloses a chipcard data transfer method wherein message authentication codes are appended to commands (Page 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the commands of Peyret to include a MAC because it is a known procedure as disclosed in Hanel (Page 1).

13. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peyret, U.S. Patent No. 5,923,884, in view of Chen, U.S. Patent No. 6,360,364, and further in view of Zumkehr, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,529 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Klingman, U.S. Patent No. 5,729,594. Referring to claim 5, Peyret discloses a method for loading applications onto a smart card wherein the system includes a smart card, terminal (client), and a server (Fig. 4). The smart card has a first interface system that may connect the smart card to the terminal and second interface to connect the terminal to the server (Fig. 4 & Col. 7, lines 33-39). When the smart card is connected to the terminal, the processor of the smart card, verifies the authenticity of the terminal and of the server and visa versa. If the server and the smart card authenticate each other, then the loader within the smart card begins the loading process (Col. 7, lines 42-67). Once an application is selected, which meets the limitation of loading a sequence of commands to download the application component to the chipcard, to be loaded the smart card authenticates the application code through the use of digital signatures (Col. 9, lines 50-53).

Digital signatures utilize private or secret keys, which meet the limitation of delivery of a secret key or session key by the server, generation of a digital signature with the secret key or session key by way of each command within the command sequence, transmission of the signed command sequence as a data packet to the client. If the digital signature is valid then the application is loaded onto the smart card (Col. 9, lines 54-57), which meets the limitation of checking of the digital signature and execution of the commands if the digital signature is correct. Chen discloses a method for installing an application wherein a desktop manager on the user terminal unpacks the application program before installing the program on the smart card (Col. 8, line 66 – Col. 9, line 22), which meets the limitation of unpacking of the data packet by the client and transmission of the individual commands in sequence to the smart card. Zumkehr discloses a system for error detection wherein individual program instructions are digitally signed and later authenticated (Col. 2, lines 29-47). Peyret does not disclose communication using SSL. Klingman discloses client server communications using SSL (Col. 3, lines 32-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use SSL in the communications of Peyret in order to provide a secure communication line as taught in Klingman (Col. 3, lines 37-39).

14. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peyret, U.S. Patent No. 5,923,884, in view of Chen, U.S. Patent No. 6,360,364, and further in view of Zumkehr, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,529 as applied to claims 1, 8 above, and further in view of Schneier. Referring to claim 9, Peyret discloses a method for loading applications onto a smart card wherein the system includes a smart card, terminal (client), and a server (Fig. 4). The smart card has a first interface system that may connect the smart card to the terminal and second interface

to connect the terminal to the server (Fig. 4 & Col. 7, lines 33-39). When the smart card is connected to the terminal, the processor of the smart card, verifies the authenticity of the terminal and of the server and visa versa. If the server and the smart card authenticate each other, then the loader within the smart card begins the loading process (Col. 7, lines 42-67). Once an application is selected, which meets the limitation of loading a sequence of commands to download the application component to the chipcard, to be loaded the smart card authenticates the application code through the use of digital signatures (Col. 9, lines 50-53). Digital signatures utilize private or secret keys, which meet the limitation of delivery of a secret key or session key by the server, generation of a digital signature with the secret key or session key by way of each command within the command sequence, transmission of the signed command sequence as a data packet to the client. If the digital signature is valid then the application is loaded onto the smart card (Col. 9, lines 54-57), which meets the limitation of checking of the digital signature and execution of the commands if the digital signature is correct. Chen discloses a method for installing an application wherein a desktop manager on the user terminal unpacks the application program before installing the program on the smart card (Col. 8, line 66 – Col. 9, line 22), which meets the limitation of unpacking of the data packet by the client and transmission of the individual commands in sequence to the smart card. Zumkehr discloses a system for error detection wherein individual program instructions are digitally signed and later authenticated (Col. 2, lines 29-47). Peyret discloses the use of public key cryptography but does not disclose the use of RSA. Schneier discloses that RSA is a form of public key cryptography (Page 366). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2132

use RSA as the public key cryptographic method in Peyret because RSA is the most popular form of public key cryptography as disclosed in Schneier (Page 366-367).

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin E Lanier whose telephone number is 571-272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30am-5:00pm, F 7:30am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Benjamin E. Lanier


GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100